

REMARKS

Claims 9-17 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that arranging applicants' device in a flow channel means that all of the emitters and sensor arrangements of the claimed device are arranged in a single flow channel, as clearly shown in Fig. 1. The Examiner's attention is also directed to page 7 of the specification, lines 2 and 3, where it is stated that a number of UV emitters 3,4,5,5,6,7,8 are arranged in this flow channel, namely the flow channel 2.

Claim 1 has further been amended to clarify that the at least one elongated sensor arrangement 15 is also arranged in the single flow channel 2. Thus, claim 1 as amended now defines the following features:

- a) a plurality of cylindrical low-pressure mercury UV emitters (3-8);
- b) wherein the UV emitters are arranged in groups in a single flow channel (2);
- c) wherein longitudinal axes of the UV emitters (3-8) are disposed substantially parallel to one another such that the UV emitters of a given group are disposed in a plane;
- d) at least one elongated sensor arrangement (15) also arranged in the single flow channel (2) for monitoring an operating state of the UV emitters;
- e) wherein the at least one elongated sensor arrangement (15) is spaced from and parallel to one of the groups of UV emitters (3-8);
- f) wherein the at least one elongated sensor arrangement (15) extends substantially transverse to the longitudinal axes of the UV emitters (3-8) of the adjacent group;
- g) wherein the at least one elongated sensor arrangement (15) is provided with a separate UV sensor (18) for each UV emitter (3-8) of the adjacent group of emitters; and

- h) at least one unit (10) connected with the at least one elongated sensor arrangement (15) and adapted to control and/or regulate the UV emitters (3-8).

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

The Examiner has rejected, among others, claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) over Hillman in view of Prieve. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The primary reference to Hillman discloses an arrangement of UV emitters that are disposed in individual tubes 14-17 that branch off from a main water inlet conduit 12. The tubes 14-17 divert flow from and back to the header 13 to which the inlet conduit 12 is connected. Thus, Hillman first of all does not provide a single flow channel for its emitters. More specifically, in Hillman an individual tube 14-17 is respectively provided for each tubular lamp 44-47. Thus, Hillman does not teach or suggest a plurality of UV emitters arranged in groups in a single flow channel as required by features a) and b) of applicants' amended claim 9, which clearly requires that all of the groups of emitters be disposed in the same flow channel. Hillman of course discloses multiple tubes, each with only a single lamp.

With regard to applicants' at least one elongated sensor arrangement 15, claim 1 now clearly defines that this sensor arrangement must be arranged in the same single flow channel as are the plurality of UV emitters. Hillman in no way teaches or suggests sensors all disposed in a single flow channel that also contains all of the UV emitters. Furthermore, since Hillman does not provide for a group of emitters in a single flow channel, it cannot teach an elongated sensor arrangement that is spaced from and parallel to one of such non-existing group of emitters, as required by applicants' feature e).

It is respectfully submitted that without a major change in the principle of operation of Hillman, it would not be possible to provide a plurality of UV emitters in groups in a single flow channel. Therefore, pursuant to MPEP 2143.01 VI, the teachings of Hillman would not be sufficient

to render applicants' claims *prima facie* obvious. Even providing Hillman with the emitters of Prieve would not solve the problem, and the proposed combination would not result in applicants' device as defined in amended claim 9.

Applicants have also added a new claim 17, which is dependent upon claim 10; support for the features of claim 17 can be found in Figs. 1 and 2, as well as in the first paragraph on page 8 of the specification. Claim 17 defines the embodiment shown in particular in Figs. 1 and 2, namely the plurality of the UV sensors in the quartz tube. This is also in no way taught nor suggested by the cited art.

In view of the foregoing discussion, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the allowability of now pending claims 9-17. In addition, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, or wish to discuss the merits of the application, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to be able to resolve any outstanding issues and to expedite placement of the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert W. Becker, Reg. No. 26,255
for Applicants

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES
707 Highway 66 East, Suite B
Tijeras, New Mexico 87059
Telephone: (505) 286-3511
Facsimile: (505) 286-3524

RWB:rac